

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing, re-examination and reconsideration of the subject matter identified in caption, as amended, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. §1.116, and in light of the remarks which follow, are respectfully requested.

By the present amendments, claims 66-69 and 95-100 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 11, 108 and 109 have been amended to incorporate the feature of allowed claims 66-68, respectively. Claims 95-100 have been rewritten in independent form as new claims 111-116. Upon entry of the present amendments, claims 1-3, 11, 12, 17-19, 59-63, 65, 70-94 and 101-116 would be pending in this application with method claims 102-104 and 107 being withdrawn from consideration.

The objection to claim 110 has been obviated by correcting the typographical error noted by the Examiner.

Claims 1-3, 11, 12, 17-19, 59-63, 65, 70-101, 105, 106 and 108-110 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,115,131 to Ishibashi et al for the reasons set forth on pages 2-3 of the Office Action. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and for at least the following reasons.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication that claims 66-69 and 110 are drawn to allowable subject matter. The feature of claims 66-68 has been added to claims 11, 108 and 109, respectively. In effect, dependent claims 66-68 have been rewritten in independent form as amended claims 11, 108 and 109. Since claims 1-3, 12,

17-19, 59-63, 65, 70-94, 101, 105 and 106 are either directly or indirectly dependent upon claims 11, 108 and 109, it necessarily follows that those dependent claims likewise are allowable.

Claims 95-100 have been rewritten as new claims 111-116. Claim 111 is identical to claim 96, claim 112, is identical to claim 95, and claims 113-116 are identical to claims 97-100, respectively. In effect, finally rejected claims 95-100 have been written in independent form as new claims.

Claims 111-116 are drawn to glass preforms. Preforms and methods of manufacturing preforms are discussed on pages 28-30 of the specification. The cited reference, *Ishibashi et al '131*, neither discloses nor suggests producing preforms, let alone preforms as defined in claims 111-116.

For at least the above reasons, the §103(a) rejection over *Ishibashi et al '131* should be withdrawn. Such action is respectfully requested.

Applicants request entry of the present Amendment since it would clearly place this application in allowable condition. No new issues have been raised since the Amendment merely rewrites dependent claims in independent form. If this application is in allowable condition except for the presence of the non-elected claims, the Examiner is authorized to cancel claims 102-104 and 107.

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is believed to be next in order and such action is earnestly solicited. If there are

Attorney's Docket No. 024705-110

Application No. 09/893,958

Page 17


any questions concerning this paper or the application in general, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (703) 838-6683 at her earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: January 13, 2004

By:


George F. Lesmes

Registration No. 19,995

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620